

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated March 18, 2005.

Specification

The Applicant has amended Page 2 of the specification to correct a typographical error. The Applicant submits that this amendment introduces no new matter.

Amendments

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to specify a method and a system for delivering an interactive printed document directly to a user on demand. Basis for this amendment can be found on page 5, lines 22-28 of the description, as well as claim 1 as previously presented.

Claims 1 and 9 have also been amended to clarify that the inkjet printer is associated with the user.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

From the most recent Office Action, it appears that the Examiner may not have had the correct version of claims. For the avoidance of doubt, the amended claims filed herewith are the claims currently pending for the present application.

In response to the Examiner's first argument that Dymetman discloses on-demand delivery of a digital document onto a user's screen, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is unambiguously limited to on-demand delivery of a printed document. Claim 1 already specified the step of printing the document. Now claim 1 additionally specifies in the preamble a method of delivering a printed interactive document. The Applicant maintains that Dymetman fails to disclose the delivery of printed interactive documents directly to users on demand.

In response to the Examiner's argument that claim 1 is not limited to printing coded data and document information at the same time, the Examiner is referred to the last two lines of claim 1, which specify "wherein said inkjet printer prints the coded data at the same time as printing the document on the surface defining structure". Claim 1 has also been amended to clarify unambiguously that "said inkjet printer" belongs to the user.

In response to the Examiner's argument that claim 1 is not limited to delivering documents to users that are "current" at any given time, the Applicant submits that advantages of an invention need not (and indeed should not) form part of the claimed subject matter. What the Applicants have claimed is a method by which users can receive interactive printed documents that may be updated and re-printed in "real-time" so that they are current at any given time. Claim 1 specifies all the technical steps necessary to achieve these advantages. Dymetman, on the other hand, does not describe a system which is able to achieve these advantages and this becomes apparent after consideration of the technical differences between the present invention and Dymetman.

The Examiner is requested to reconsider the Applicant's previous submissions in view of the above remarks and the clarifying amendments filed herewith. It appears that these previous submissions have not yet been given full consideration by the Examiner.

It is submitted that all the Examiner's objections have been traversed. Reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762